UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/165,683	10/02/98	SHTEYN Y	PHA23-483

WM02/1109

US PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

EXAMINER	
ZHEN, L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2151	3

DATE MAILED: 11/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/165,683	SHTEYN, YEVGENIY EUGENE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Li B. Zhen	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed March 13, 2000 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
It does not identify the citizenship of each inventor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Chambers International Publication No. WO 98/16886.

Chambers teaches (P. 9, lines 20 – 32) an information processing system with a first physical component (real device 102 – 116, Fig. 1) represented by a first software object (abstract device 202, Fig. 2), a second physical component object (real device 102 – 116, Fig. 1) represented by a second component object (abstract device 202, Fig. 2), a first property (status) that is changeable through a first call (command message) to the first object, a second property (status) that is changeable through a second call (command message) to the second object. The system (P. 10, lines 30 – 34) enables registering a property route (event) linking first object (abstract device wishing to notify) and second object (abstract device interested in being notified) such that a change in the first property (status of abstract device wishing to notify changes) causes second call to the second object (abstract device interested in being notified). Chambers teaches supplying attributes to identify routes (P. 11 lines 20 – 21).

As to claim 2, Chambers teaches (P. 9, lines 22 – 25) changing properties using calls. After a property changes (P. 11, lines 15 – 21), the first object initiates look-up action (query registry) to identify property routes. Chambers uses identifiers (attributes) to identify property routes. Matching property routes are initialized (P. 10, lines 23 – 27).

As to claim 3, Chambers provides identifiers (attributes) to identify routes. These attributes are used to identify events in the system.

As to claim 4 and 5, Chambers teaches (P. 11, lines 10 – 20) a system that enables software applications (abstract devices) to register routes. Chambers used

identifiers to identify events in the system and it can include a reference to the software application (abstract device) that will receive notification.

As to claim 6, Chambers teaches (P. 11, lines 10 – 20) a system that enables software application (abstract device) to register a property route and the property route comprises a reference to the software application (reference to an abstract device that will receive messages).

As to 7, Chambers teaches (P. 11, lines 18 – 20) un-registering routes.

As to claims 8 and 9, these are method claims that correspond to the system claims 1 – 2; note the rejections of claims 1 – 2 above, which also meet the method claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traughber EP 713178 in view of Berdahl U.S. Patent No. 5,713,045.

Traughber teaches (column 2, lines 9 – 11 and lines 22 – 28; column 5, lines 11 – 13 and lines 45 – 50; column 6, lines 30 – 40 and 47 – 58) an information processing system between a first software object (second software application object 1c, Fig. 1; represented by stateful object 2a, Fig. 2), a second software object (first software application object 1a, Fig. 1), each software object includes properties (state) that is

changeable through calls (methods), the system enables registering a property route (Add Interest 3b, Fig. 3) so that a change in first property (state transition) notifies second object (first software application object) upon invoking property route (dispatching interest). Traughber does not teach associating an identifier with the input call to the first object to conditionally invoke routes; however, he uses identifiers (news type identifier, stateful object identifier, dispatcher identifier) to distinguish between a set of routes (interests). It would have been obvious that you can include these identifiers in the input call to identify the routes. Traughber does not disclose using software objects to represent physical components.

Berdahl teaches (column 13, lines 15 – 25) an event notification system where software objects are used to represent physical components (input device).

It would have been obvious that the software object of Traughber could be used to represent physical components as taught by Berdahl because it would allow the computer to control the physical devices via a software object.

As to claim 2, Traughber teaches (column 7, lines 15 – 47) a first object (second software application) that initiates a look-up action (circulate function 3e, Fig. 3) to determine if any property route (interest) is associated with the change of the first property (news object). Traughber uses an identifier to find associated property routes. The matching routes are invoked (dispatched).

As to claim 3, Traughber teaches (column 5, lines 45 – 50) an identifier that comprises a reference to a scenario of operating the system (news type identifier).

As to claim 4, Traughber teaches (column 5, lines 45 – 50; column 6, lines 55 - 58) a system that enables software application to register property route (Add Interest 3b, Fig. 3) and the identifier comprised a reference to the software application (stateful object identifier).

As to claim 5, Traughber teaches (column 5, lines 45 – 50) an identifier that comprises a reference to a scenario of operating the system (news type identifier).

As to claim 6, Traughber teaches (column 5, lines 45 – 50; column 6, 55 – 58) a system that enables a software application to register a property route (interest) and the property route comprises a reference to the software application (stateful object identifier).

As to claim 7, Traughber teaches (column 7, lines 1 – 8) un-registering property routes (Remove Interest 3c, Fig. 3).

As to claims 8 and 9, these are method claims that correspond to the system claims 1 – 2, note the rejections of claims 1- 2 above, which also meet the method claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2151

lbz
November 5, 2001

ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100